

END BUSINESS AS USUAL ON
DAIRY PRICES

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if we can cut through the partisan bloviating we have just heard for a few minutes, I would like to note something else.

I have voted against every farm bill that has been in front of this House for the last 10 years because those bills guaranteed that the dairy farmers from the upper Midwest would receive significantly lower prices than farmers in other regions of the country. This week a Federal court struck down those milk marketing orders as being arbitrary and capricious. That court is right. They ordered the USDA to no longer enforce those milk marketing orders.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end business as usual on this issue. Congress and the USDA and major dairy organizations need to recognize that major changes must be made in the milk marketing order system. Until those changes are made, the responsible thing to do is to vote against any other farm legislation that comes to this floor.

SCHOOL CHOICE

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, Jonathan Rauch writes on school choice in the November 10 edition of the New Republic. He says he has always found it odd that liberals have handed the issue to Republicans rather than grabbing it for themselves.

He says, and I quote:

It is hard to get excited about improving rich suburban schools. However, for poor children trapped, the case is moral rather than merely educational. These kids attend schools which cannot protect them, much less teach them. To require poor people to go to dangerous, dysfunctional schools that better-off people fled and would never tolerate for their own children, all the while intoning pieties about "saving" public education, is worse than unsound public policy. It is repugnant public policy.

Mr. Rauch, we agree.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND
AND REVISE REMARKS IN CON-
GRESSIONAL RECORD UNTIL
LAST EDITION IS PUBLISHED

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have until publication of the last edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD authorized for the first session by the Joint Committee on Printing to revise and extend their remarks and to include brief, related extraneous material on any matter occurring before the adjournment of the first session sine die.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 0915

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PALLONE moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 38, nays 308, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

YEAS—38

Andrews	Fazio	Mink
Blumenauer	Filner	Pallone
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	Pelosi
Bonior	Gejdenson	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Gephardt	Sabo
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Smith, Adam
Conyers	Jefferson	Thurman
Coyne	Johnson, E. B.	Torres
Delahunt	Kennelly	Towns
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Velazquez
Doggett	Markey	Wise
Etheridge	McDermott	Woolsey
Evans	McNulty	

NAYS—308

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	Dickey
Aderholt	Bryant	Dicks
Allen	Bunning	Dooley
Archer	Burr	Doyle
Armey	Buyer	Dreier
Bachus	Callahan	Duncan
Baessler	Calvert	Dunn
Baker	Camp	Edwards
Baldacci	Campbell	Ehlers
Ballenger	Cannon	Emerson
Barcia	Cardin	English
Barr	Castle	Ensign
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Eshoo
Barrett (WI)	Chambliss	Everett
Bartlett	Christensen	Ewing
Barton	Clay	Fattah
Bass	Clement	Fawell
Bateman	Coble	Ford
Bentsen	Coburn	Fossella
Bereuter	Collins	Fowler
Berman	Combest	Fox
Berry	Condit	Franks (NJ)
Bilbray	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Bilirakis	Costello	Frost
Bishop	Cramer	Furse
Blagojevich	Cummings	Galleghy
Bliley	Cunningham	Ganske
Blunt	Danner	Gekas
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Gibbons
Boehner	Davis (VA)	Gilchrist
Borski	Deal	Gillmor
Boswell	DeFazio	Goode
Boyd	DeGette	Goodlatte
Brady	DeLay	Goodling
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gordon

Goss	Maloney (NY)	Ryun
Green	Martinez	Salmon
Gutierrez	Mascara	Sanchez
Gutknecht	Matsui	Sandlin
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (MO)	Sanford
Hamilton	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Hansen	McCollum	Saxton
Hastert	McGovern	Schaefer, Dan
Hastings (WA)	McHale	Schaffer, Bob
Hayworth	McHugh	Schumer
Hefley	McInnis	Scott
Herger	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner
Hill	McKeon	Sessions
Hilleary	Meehan	Shadegg
Hilliard	Menendez	Shays
Hinchey	Metcalfe	Sherman
Hinojosa	Mica	Shimkus
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hoekstra	Minge	Sisisky
Holden	Moakley	Skaggs
Hooley	Moran (KS)	Skelton
Horn	Moran (VA)	Slaughter
Hostettler	Morella	Smith (MI)
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Myrick	Smith (OR)
Hulshof	Nadler	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Nethercutt	Smith, Linda
Hutchinson	Neumann	Snowbarger
Hyde	Ney	Snyder
Inglis	Northup	Solomon
Istook	Norwood	Souder
Jackson (IL)	Nussle	Spence
Jenkins	Obeys	Stabenow
John	Ortiz	Stearns
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Stenholm
Johnson (WI)	Packard	Stokes
Jones	Pappas	Strickland
Kanjorski	Pascarell	Stump
Kelly	Pastor	Stupak
Kennedy (MA)	Paul	Sununu
Kennedy (RI)	Paxon	Talent
Kildee	Pease	Tanner
Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Kim	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Kind (WI)	Pickering	Thomas
King (NY)	Pickett	Thompson
Kingston	Pitts	Thornberry
Klink	Pomeroy	Thune
Klug	Portman	Tiahrt
Knollenberg	Poshard	Tierney
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Trafilant
LaHood	Quinn	Turner
Lampson	Rahall	Upton
Lantos	Ramstad	Vento
Latham	Redmond	Visclosky
LaTourette	Regula	Walsh
Lazio	Reyes	Wamp
Levin	Rivers	Waters
Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	Watkins
Lewis (KY)	Roemer	Watt (NC)
Linder	Rogan	Watts (OK)
Lipinski	Rogers	Weldon (PA)
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Weygand
Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen	White
Lowe	Rothman	Whitfield
Lucas	Roukema	Wolf
Luther	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Royce	

NOT VOTING—87

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Becerra	Graham	Neal
Bono	Granger	Oberstar
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Olver
Burton	Hall (OH)	Owens
Canady	Harman	Parker
Carson	Hefner	Payne
Chenoweth	Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Clayton	(TX)	Porter
Cooksey	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Kaptur	Radanovich
Crane	Kasich	Rangel
Crapo	Klecza	Riggs
Cubin	Kolbe	Riley
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Rush
DeLauro	Largent	Sanders
Dellums	Leach	Scarborough
Dingell	Livingston	Schiff
Dixon	Manton	Serrano
Doolittle	Manzullo	Shaw
Ehrlich	McCrery	Skeen
Engel	McDade	Spratt
Farr	McIntosh	Stark
Flake	McKinney	Tauzin
Foglietta	Meek	Taylor (NC)
Foley	Millender-	Waxman
Forbes	McDonald	Weldon (FL)
Gilman	Miller (CA)	

Weller
Wexler

Wicker
Yates

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 0940

Messrs. EHLERS, NETHERCUTT, HILL, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during rollcall votes 575 and 606. If present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 575 and "no" on rollcall 606.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 858, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of October 30, 1997 I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 858) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the order of the House of October 30, 1997 the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, October 28, 1997, at page H9586.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 858) that authorizes funds for intelligence and intelligence-related activities, and for other purposes, for fiscal year 1998.

All such conference reports are, Mr. Speaker, as this one is, a compromise that, unfortunately, represents a significant reduction in funding for intelligence activities from our authorization passed by this body in June. But these reductions, when combined with some of the actions we have taken in appropriations, will mean the intelligence community will do without some much needed resources in several areas.

That said, however, this conference report does set the stage for some work we will be doing over the next several years to ensure that this Nation has

the intelligence capability it needs. Therefore, I strongly support the passage of this report.

I would like to thank the members of the committee who worked hard to craft this bill, particularly the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], the ranking member. I appreciate, as well, the fine efforts of our subcommittee chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM]. In fact, I thank all the members of the committee who played constructive roles throughout this process; and, indeed, that was every member of the committee.

Also, Mr. Speaker, special acknowledgment goes to the members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence for their cooperation as we came together to make tough decisions on how best to invest in the future of our intelligence community for the benefit of our country.

□ 0945

Of course, there is no way we could be here today without the dedication, professionalism and perseverance of the staffs on both sides of the aisle and on both committees. I say that because we have a good working relationship, it is bipartisan, and bicameral, and it shows.

Finally, some applause most go to the Members and the staffs of the House Committees on National Security and Appropriations for their sustaining cooperation throughout this authorization's legislative journey. It has been a good working relationship and a good product as a result.

Mr. Speaker, this bill could not be more timely. Over the last few days, much time has been spent by Members deliberating very serious issues relating to the future relationship that the United States should have with Russia and with China. Indeed, we will be debating more on China today. Significant questions have been raised regarding these countries' roles in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, proliferation that could result in placing our Nation at serious risk, thus comprising a direct threat to our national security.

I do not intend to get into the policy side of this debate here today. Whether we decide that sanctions should be imposed or continued on these countries is secondary, but there is a fact here that simply cannot be ignored. As a Nation, we will not be able to gauge the success or failure of our policies or know the threat without an effective intelligence community. We simply have to have the eyes and ears to let us know what is going on.

We are told that there are no Russian missiles aimed at American children as they go to bed at night. Mr. Speaker, how do we know that for sure? How can we make that statement with certainty? How long will it take to retarget such weapons? How can we know how tenuous is the chain of command

in the Russian strategic rocket forces? And how are we to catch profiteers trying to steal and sell suitcase nukes, if indeed they exist? And how are we to uncover and disrupt the secret nuclear weapons programs underway in hostile rogue states we read about virtually every day in the paper and see on television every night? The answer to all of these questions is one word, "intelligence."

And then there is China, Mr. Speaker. We will soon begin the debate again on the certification of China. Hanging in the balance could be United States access to the Chinese nuclear reactor market, reportedly a \$50 billion trade opportunity. Or is it an opportunity? To do this, though, we must have confidence that the Chinese have stopped proliferating weapons of mass destruction components, systems and technologies, something that the Chinese President has promised to do. How good is that promise? But how will we know? How will we know that the technology we provide has been secretly diverted to military programs or to rogue regimes? Again the answer is simple, intelligence. Intelligence is what we count on to answer these questions, and we want these questions answered.

Mr. Speaker, weapons proliferation is a sufficiently grave problem for me to argue the need for dynamic intelligence community capabilities. But there are other problems also at play. Terrorism, narcotics, and racketeering are some of the transnational issues we talk about that are endangering our Nation's well-being and for which we must have strong intelligence capability.

Also included in the need for intelligence is its crucial role supporting our military forces, our war fighters, mission one, whether they are deployed for war or for other less well-defined humanitarian or peacekeeping missions where we are doing force protection. Intelligence requirements have grown tremendously and intelligence-related technologies have revolutionized our defense and warfare doctrines.

As we know, it is intelligence that puts the smart in the smart weapons. But it goes well beyond that. Intelligence is the centerpiece of the doctrine of Dominant Battlefield Awareness, which has been endorsed by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by our Armed Services.

But, the Defense Department needs to make the hard decision to invest more for intelligence if it truly desires to achieve the capabilities it says it needs to support our forces. I encourage them to take that message during the next year. Indeed, I find it somewhat puzzling that if this is the direction that DOD wants to go, why are there continued efforts to, "tax" defense intelligence agencies and programs even more? Why has the Defense Reform Task Force apparently been talking about significant cuts to defense intelligence, up to 25 percent?